



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,676	09/07/2006	Robert Skog	P18957-US1	8725
27045	7590	02/16/2011	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			KASRAIAN, ALLAHYAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

CONTINUATION SHEET

Response to Arguments

1. Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On page 9 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant asserts, "It is difficult for the Applicant to substantively respond directly to the Examiner's arguments because the Examiner has selectively disagreed with some of Applicant's arguments, and ignored others. For example, Applicant argued that Carden does not show combining the telephone number of the mobile with a web service identifier, or registering the combined identifier/telephone number with a registration unit. The Examiner disagreed and cited paragraph 0021 of Carden for showing the identifier/telephone number combination, but he was silent as to the registering step." In response, Examiner notes that the registering step was addressed in the Final Office Action, it indicated that the limitation was taught on par. 0020 of Carden. Furthermore, Applicant did not provide any argument against the cited paragraph of Carden. For sake of clarifying, par. 0020 of Carden discloses "a method for assigning web-page addresses and/or e-mail addresses utilizing telephone numbers as part of the domain name may be performed by or for a host". One skilled in the art should realize the host registers the unique identification (web-page addresses and/or e-mail addresses utilizing telephone numbers) as domain name.

In the bridging paragraph between page 9 and 10 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, in his discussion of Van Gassel, "the Examiner did not respond substantively to the Applicant's arguments regarding limitations that are not shown. Instead, he said one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually when the rejection is based on a combination of references. Clearly, however, the references have to be discussed one at a time in order to show that there are *common features* that are not shown by either one, and thus are not shown or suggested by the combination. Applicant's arguments identified a number of common features that are not disclosed or suggested by either Carden or Van Gassel. If the Examiner had looked at the preceding paragraph addressing Carden, he would have seen that the same limitations were identified as missing in the references. Thus the combination of Carden and Van Gassel does not: disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations and therefore, does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness as required by MPEP 2143." Examiner respectfully disagrees since the Applicant argument is still not clear which paragraph of Carden and which limitations were identified as missing. However, the Examiner's position is: Carden discloses the first and second limitation regarding receiving and registering a unique identification (assigning a web page address or URL with the telephone number), and Van Gassel discloses "receiving by a registration unit, a request from the first mobile node to register the web service of the first mobile node; and registering, at the registration unit, the unique identification information together with locating information for the web service at the first mobile node"

(see FIGS. 1 and 2, abstract, par. 0070, 0083-0085 of Van Gassel). However, the part does not disclose by Van Gassel is: “the request including unique identification information comprising the web service identifier and a unique circuit-switched identifier of the first mobile node” which is disclosed by Carden.

On the first full paragraph of page 10 of the Applicants arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, “By way of further explanation, a distinguishing feature between the claimed invention and the combination of Garden and Van Gassel is that in the invention, a web service registration is identified by a web service identifier and a unique circuit-switched identifier while in Carden, web addresses and email addresses are identified by a telephone number.” Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant. Carden clearly discloses “assigning web-page addresses and/or e-mail addresses utilizing telephone numbers as part of the domain name may be performed by or for a host”. Paragraph 0021 of Carden further discloses “the telephone number of the applicant is (123) 456-7890, then the server may assign the URL ‘www.1234567890.theserver.com’ to that entity.” Therefore, Carden discloses the combination of an URL and a phone number as identification to register for a web service (not as web addresses and email addresses are identified by a telephone number as Applicant asserts).

On the second full paragraph of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues that Van Gassel fails to disclose the first and second limitations, However, as described above Van Gassel discloses a connection from a second

user (A) to access a web service through the connection that made by the first user (B), which Carden discloses the unique identification of the user B, and ISP.

On the last paragraph of page 10 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant asserts, "A technical effect achieved by the invention's distinguishing feature is that the unique identifier in the invention enables coordination of all web service requests, The objective problem is hence to achieve an improved web service registration procedure. This is very different from both Carden and Van Gassel" However, Examiner notes, the distinguishing feature" does not disclose in the claim.

On the first and second paragraph of page 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant describe the advantages of his/her invention. However, Examiner notes that the described details and benefits cannot be recognized in the board claims. Moreover, Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claim. The Examiner is not limited to Applicant's definition, which is not specifically set fourth in the claims, In re Tanaka et al, 193 USPQ 139, (CCPA) 1977.

On the third paragraph of page 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, "Even if Carden shows a telephone number combined with web addresses, Carden does not show any unique identification information associated with web service registration" Examiner respectfully disagrees since the Carden discloses the web service registration in par. 0020, 0021 and 0024. One skilled in the art should know the identification of user recognized by a server, is part of accessing to internet or web service.

On the forth paragraph of page 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, "In addition, Carden does not relate to coordination of service requests and does not contain any guidance for a person of ordinary skill to solve the above-stated object." In response to applicant's argument that Carden is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

On the fifth paragraph of page 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant repeats the argument, "Carden and Van Gassel do not show an identifier comprising circuit switched identifier in combination with a web service identifier" Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as stated above.

On the sixth paragraph of page 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, "Further, since Carden and Van :Gassel do not mention web service registration nor indicate a need for web service registration procedures, and in particular do not teach or suggest the use of corresponding unique identification information, it would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to: arrive at the solution of the present invention" Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or

Art Unit: 2617

motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the ad-hoc links between the mobile nodes as taught by Van Gassel to the method web registration for a device as disclosed by Carden for purpose of providing Internet application access to the other device in ad-hoc network.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 48, see the bridging paragraph between pages 11 and 12 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, are not persuasive since Applicant refers to the similar arguments as provided for the independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement submitted on 01/24/2011 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.